

Simon Lin – State Bar No. 313661
4388 Still Creek Drive, Suite 237
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada V5C 6C6
T : 604-620-2666
F : 778-805-9830
E : simonlin@evolinklaw.com

Attorney for Defendant Adam Khimji

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
(San Francisco)

VISUAL SUPPLY COMPANY, a Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ADAM KHIMJI, an individual and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case Number: 3:24-cv-09361-WHO

**DEFENDANT ADAM KHIMJI'S
SECOND STATEMENT OF RECENT
DECISIONS FOR MOTION TO DISMISS
AND/OR STAY [Docket #15]**

Judge: Senior District Judge William H. Orrick

Date: June 18, 2025

Time: 2:00 p.m.

**DEFENDANT ADAM KHIMJI'S SECOND STATEMENT OF RECENT DECISIONS
FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND/OR STAY [Docket #15]**

Case Number: 3:24-cv-09361-WHO

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3(d)(2), Defendant respectfully brings to the Court's attention **two (2)** relevant decisions relating to personal jurisdiction. In the current case, Defendant's motion to dismiss or stay for lack of personal jurisdiction remains pending in this Court as part of ECF No. 15.

1. A relevant decision issued in *Tracy v. Bowen*, Case No. H052028 from the Court of Appeals of California, Sixth District. on June 10, 2025 (not for publication¹).

A true and correct copy of the decision is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. The court in *Tracy* affirmed the trial court's granting of the defendants' motion to quash for lack of personal jurisdiction involving a website routed through California servers.

2. A relevant decision issued in *Prime Capital v. MaCkenzie*, Case No. 25-cv-570-RSH-SBC. (S.D. Cal.) on June 11, 2025. A true and correct copy of the decision is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**. The court in *Prime Capital* granted the defendants' motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction in a case involving a foreign person, and jurisdictional discovery was also refused.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 17, 2025

By: Simon Lin

Simon Lin – State Bar No. 313661

¹ Federal courts may consider unpublished state decisions even though such opinions have no precedential value. While these opinions are certainly not dispositive of how the California Supreme Court would rule, they may lend support to the contention that they accurately represent California law. The Court may cite unpublished California appellate decisions as persuasive authority. *Holt v. Noble House Hotels & Resort, Ltd*, 370 F. Supp. 3d 1158, 1165 (S.D. Cal. 2019) citing two Ninth Circuit decisions.